		1
1		
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
4	Case No. 05-44481	
5		
6	In the Matter of:	
7		
8	DELPHI CORPORATION,	
9		
10	Debtor.	
11		
12		
13		
14	United States Bankruptcy Court	
15	One Bowling Green	
16	New York, New York	
17		
18	August 5, 2007	
19	10:05 AM	
20		
21	BEFORE:	
22	HON. ROBERT D. DRAIN	
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
24		
25		

HEARING re Expedited motion for order authorizing and approving Delphi-Appaloosa equity purchase and commitment agreement pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 105(a), 353(b) and 503(b) and 507(a) (Docket No. 8673).

3 1 APPEARANCES: 2 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, LLP 3 Attorneys for Debtor 4 333 West Wacker Drive 5 Chicago, IL 60606 6 7 BY: JOHN BUTLER, JR., ESQ. 8 ALBERT L. HOGAN, III, ESQ. 9 10 11 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, LLP 12 Attorneys for Debtor 13 Four Times Square 14 New York, NY 10036 15 16 BY: KAYALYN A. MARAFIOTI, ESQ. 17 18 19 LOWENSTEIN, SANDLER, P.C. 20 Attorneys for Lead Plaintiffs 21 63 Livingston Avenue 22 Roseland, NJ 07068 23 24 MICHAEL S. ETKIN, ESQ. BY: 25 S. JASON TEELE, ESQ.

4 1 FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON, LLP 2 Attorneys for Equity Committee 3 One New York Plaza 4 New York, NY 10004 5 6 BY: BONNIE STEINGART, ESQ. 7 8 9 WEIL, GOTSHAL AND MANGES, LLP 10 Attorneys for General Motors 11 767 Fifth Avenue 12 New York, NY 10153 13 14 BY: MICHAEL P. KESSLER, ESQ. 15 16 17 TOGUT, SEGAL & SEGAL, LLP 18 Attorneys for Conflicts Counsel to Debtor 19 One Penn Plaza 20 New York, NY 10110 21 22 BY: LARA R. SHEIKH, ESQ. 23 24 25

LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP Attorneys for Unsecured Creditors Committee 885 Third Avenue New York, NY 10022 BY: MARK A. BROUDE, ESQ.

Pa 6 of 22 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. Delphi 3 Corporation. 4 MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, good morning. Jack Butler, 5 Kayalyn Marafioti and Al Hogan on behalf of -- from Skadden 6 Arps on behalf of Delphi Corporation for this omnibus hearing 7 to consider the proposed Delphi/Appaloosa investment agreement. 8 This was filed -- the motion was filed at docket number 8673 9 and we're here before the Court in an order to show cause 10 entered by the Court on July 19, 2007 at docket number 8694. 11 Your Honor, the only response that's been filed to 12 this motion that could be construed as an objection was filed 13 by Highland Capital Management, LP at docket number 8642 and 14 again at 8754. Judith Elkin is here on behalf of Highland 15 Capital and at -- prior to the commencement of the hearing this 16 morning she confirmed, on behalf of Highland, to me that 17 Highland does not consider that filing to constitute an 18 objection nor, from their perspective, for this to be a 19 contested hearing. I'd like Ms. Elkin to confirm that on the

MS. ELKIN: That's correct, Your Honor.

20

21

22

23

24

25

record.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, what I'd like to do, briefly if I can, to put in the evidentiary record, and there are a number of stakeholders, including both the statutory committees

and General Motors who would like to be heard briefly on the motion today.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUTLER: What I'd first like to do, Your Honor, is begin with -- in the evidentiary record, is begin with the exhibits. We have prepared a joint index of exhibits. There were -- there are ninety-nine of them. Essentially, the exhibits include the declarations of Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Reznick and Mr. Miller who have provided testimony in support of the Exhibits number 4 through 11 are the actual transaction documents for Delphi and Appaloosa and we have -for the Appaloosa transaction we have, I'll just point out to Your Honor, put black lines in at Exhibits 12 and 13. black-line this against earlier EPGAs received from Appaloosa, particularly number 13 is the black-line against the original EPGA. We have also, then, at Exhibits 14 through 20, put in the Highland Capital final proposal documents. We've also black-lined those documents against two earlier EPGAs received from Highland, one on July 1st and one back on January 9th of this year.

Documents -- Exhibits number 21 through 44 are a series of exhibits that involve communications and presentations between Highland and Delphi. And then Exhibits 45 through 47 black line and compare the investment proposal, the EPGA, the equity commitment letters and the proposal

letters between Appaloosa and Highland. Those black lines were -- the contents of those black lines were reviewed by the board of directors at the July 17th evening meeting and again on July 18th with the transaction committee.

Documents 48 through 51 are the exhibits that are the presentations by Rothschild, Inc., Delphi's investment banker and strategic financial advisor that were presented to the board of directors on July 16th and 17th of this year.

We have included at Exhibits 52 through 58, excerpts from the joint meeting of our Delphi statutory committees dating all the way back to February 7th that outline the evolution of the plan, framework and investment discussions leading up to the board's approval of the current EPGA that's before the Court.

Exhibits 59 through 76 are the meetings, some fifteen meetings, of the board of directors that have occurred since we were last before Your Honor on an EPGA during the first six months of this year.

Exhibits 77 through 82 are the press releases issued by the company with respect to these matters. And then just rounding it out, Exhibits 83 through 90 are court documents concerning the original EPGA and the PSA, the planned support agreement. Just a note here, Your Honor, there is no plan framework support agreement with this EPGA; instead those provisions that were relevant to the plan framework are now

attached as Exhibit B to this EPGA. And then finally, at Exhibit 91 through 96 are court documents relating to the current EPGA before the Court and there's some demonstrative exhibits at 97 to 99.

We did hold a meet and confer, as requires by the order to show cause, on Monday that was participated in by the statutory committees and by Highland, among others. And we did serve these exhibits as required by the order to show cause and we have confirmed that there are no parties, that at least we're aware of, that participated in the meet and confer that have any objections to the admission of these matters into evidence. And therefore, Your Honor, I move the admission of Exhibits 1 through 99.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just confirm that. Does anyone object to the admission of these documents into evidence for purposes of this hearing? Okay. I will admit them in.

(Declarations of Mr. Sheehan, Reznick and Miller were hereby received as joint Exhibits 1-4 for identification, as of this date.)

(Transaction Documents was hereby received as joint Exhibits 4-11 for identification, as of this date.)

(Black Lined Copies against earlier EPGA were hereby received

as joint Exhibits 12-13 for identification, as of this date.)

(Highland Capital Proposal Documents were hereby received as

joint Exhibits 14-20 for identification, as of this date.)

10 1 (Communications and Presentations between Highland and Delphi 2 were hereby received as joint Exhibits 21-44 for 3 identification, as of this date.) 4 (Black line Investment Proposal were hereby received as joint 5 Exhibits 45-47 for identification, as of this date.) 6 (Presentations by Rothschild, Inc. were hereby received as 7 joint Exhibits 48-51 for identification, as of this date.) 8 (Excerpts from Joint Meeting of Delphi Statutory Committees 9 were hereby received as joint Exhibits 52-58 for 10 identification, as of this date.) 11 (Meetings of Board of Directors were hereby received as joint 12 Exhibits 59-76 for identification, as of this date.) 13 (Press Releases were hereby received as joint Exhibits 77-82 14 for identification, as of this date.) 15 (Court Documents regarding EPGA and PSA were hereby received as 16 joint Exhibits 83-90 for identification, as of this date.) 17 (Court Documents Relating to Current EPGA were hereby received 18 as joint Exhibits 91-96 for identification, as of this date.) 19 (Demonstrative Exhibits were hereby received as joint Exhibits 97-99 for identification, as of this date.) 20 21 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, 22 turning to the declarations, and just to briefly run through 23 them, the first declaration that we would have is the 24 declaration of John D. Sheehan, our chief restructuring officer 25 in support of the EPGA. That -- I've just moved that into

evidence subject to cross examination. Mr. Sheehan is in the courtroom, Your Honor, and I would present him to the Court for any questions or for cross examination by any party.

THE COURT: Okay. I've reviewed the declaration; does anyone wish to cross examine Mr. Sheehan? Okay, then I'll admit the declaration as a proffer of his testimony.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, we've sought to admit, as Exhibit number 2, the declaration of David L. Reznick, from Rothschild, Inc., the company's senior investment banker and I would like to present now, Mr. Reznick, to the Court for any questions from the Court or for cross examination from any party.

THE COURT: Okay. I've -- I've read Mr. Reznick's declaration and the exhibits that were attached. Does anyone wish to cross examine him? All right, then I'll admit that into evidence as well, as his testimony.

MR. BUTLER: And finally, Your Honor, we have in court today the executive chairman of Delphi Corporation, Steve Miller, whose declaration is Exhibit 3 which we've sought to admit into evidence. And now present him for any questions from the Court or cross examination from any party.

THE COURT: Okay. And again, I've read Mr. Miller's declaration. Does anyone wish to cross examine him on it? All right, then I will, again, admit his declaration as his testimony.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, that -- the admission of the 99 exhibits including the three declarations from the party witnesses are the -- constitute the evidentiary record in support of the EPGA. We have, in our motion and in our response, detailed along in the declarations -- detailed at some length the basis and the process the company used to go forward and come to the point where the company thought it was appropriate in the best interest of the estate to approve this EPGA and bring it to this Court for approval. In the -- given that this has done so with the broad support of our statutory committees and General Motors and it has been reviewed with other parties who have had input, including the MDL plaintiffs among others, who are also represented in the courtroom today, Your Honor, I'm going to rely on the papers that we've submitted rather than to make any kind of extended argument today. I would like, however, to cede the podium to representatives of each of the statutory committees and to General Motors who I know want to make statements. And then to any other party who wants to make a statement, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BROUDE: Good morning, Your Honor. Mark Broude,
Latham and Watkins, LLP on behalf of the Official Committee of
Unsecured Creditors.

As Mr. Butler has indicated, the creditors committee supports the relief being sought today. It supports the

Appaloosa/Delphi investment agreement. It's the product of long and occasionally difficult negotiations. And while the parties have not always agreed that they've all worked together cooperatively and in good faith towards what we think is a deal worth pursuing. And as I said, the committee supports them wholeheartedly.

Just one side item, and that is we just -- the members of the committee just want to make clear something which is in the documents but takes some reading to get through. And that is, what is referred to as the par rights offering in Exhibit B will be conducted on the same time frame as the capital R rights offerings, so they'll both close by the effective date. But with that clarification, Your Honor, the committee does wholeheartedly support the relief being sought.

THE COURT: Okay. And actually I have a question for both you and Ms. Steingart that was raised by the -- I guess the revised plan framework that came in the other night. It contemplates an ability by shareholders to; in essence, purchase the stock that would be otherwise going to the unsecured creditors and GM.

MR. BROUDE: And the UAW, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the UAW. Is there going to be -- is there also some -- some election process contemplated for -- under the plan for the unsecured creditors to indicate whether they're willing to take cash instead of stock?

MR. BROUDE: I think, Your Honor, the way it's set up is that for the roughly 522,000,000 dollars at plan value stock that goes into the par rights offering, that's not an affirmative election by the unsecured creditors. That's therefore the equity they can either take it or not as they choose. And so it's more -- it's more their option rather than hours.

THE COURT: All right. But -- but it would be cash in full.

MR. BROUDE: Yeah, if -- you know, to the extent that it's exercised it will be cash at the plan value, forty-five dollars per share.

THE COURT: And so it would be pro rata cash?

MR. BROUDE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's fine.

MS. STEINGART: Well, it certainly is -- well, good morning, Your Honor. Bonnie Steingart from Fried Frank on behalf of the equity committee.

It certainly is a pleasure to appear before the Court this morning and to be united, both with the other statutory committee and the debtor in seeking the Court's approval of these agreements. The process has been one where the debtors facilitated the inclusion of the equity committee, facilitated our participation in these negotiations. As you've heard, those negotiations at some times were lengthy and sometimes

acrimonious, but they did result in a good faith negotiation and arms length agreement. And we support that agreement in all its particulars. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael Kessler, Weil, Gotshal and Manges for General Motors Corporation.

General Motors also is supportive of the EPGA and the approval of the motion. And we're also optimistic that the ultimate confirmation of a plan that would be undertaken by the EPGA will finally come to light. To be sure, Your Honor, there remains several agreements that are continued under negotiation between General Motors and Delphi that are integral to the overall transaction. We continue to negotiate those. We're optimistic that they will be completed within the near future. And indeed we are negotiating sometimes even around the clock to complete those negotiations.

THE COURT: And that's pursuant to the process that was outlined at the last chambers' conference? That's still the process that's been going on for those negotiations?

MR. KESSLER: I was not at the chambers' conference but I believe you're correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thanks.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, we -- in the omnibus reply that we filed yesterday on behalf of the debtors; we filed a

black-line order that had several changes in it. I just wanted to briefly summarize them again, on the record, and answer any questions the Court may have.

First, there was a finding in the order based on Your Honor's prior -- the prior record and what we believe to be the case, which is this EPGA is not a sub rosa plan and we believe that that finding is supported by the record now, the evidentiary record that's before the Court.

In paragraph 3 of the order, we also wanted to make it very clear, that the debtors and plan investors have an amendment right. That amendment right is -- part of that amendment right is already in the EPGA that underlies the -- the approval order. But that we would have the right to make amendments that aren't material to the investment agreements or such other amendments that haven't been objected to by the creditors or equity committee, assuming they have -- they get five business days prior notice or agree to a shorter period of time.

THE COURT: On that point, are you going to give them the committees notice of -- of all the amendments?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: We'll be -- we'll provide them -- we're working pretty closely with the committees and they'll be advised of all the changes. But the -- we either consent only

if the -- there's not objection only if it's a material change.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BUTLER: And I should just say, Your Honor, and I think it's clear from the record here that has been made. But Exhibit B to the EPGA and the EPGA itself has a number of -- a lot of numbers in it that relate to share allocations and so forth. Those numbers, ultimately, are going to change as we get the final business plan in place and we sort out the actual number of shares to be issued that were relative -- sharing arrangements, if you will, that have been negotiated, or the absolute dollar amounts are not going to change. But the -- there are going to be changes to the numbers throughout the document, for example, as we get the mechanics worked out on how to fully implement this.

The other change we made, which is the -- the two other changes we made, is clearly if -- if this is not a sub rosa plan, as the debtors maintain that it is not and I don't think it clearly is not, then the flip side of that coin is that no one -- nothing in the order should limit the rights of any party in interest to object or present evidence and so forth at a confirmation hearing with respect to other legally cognizable objections to confirmation. We're asked to make that clear in the order and so we added a paragraph to do that, a paragraph 7.

And then finally, in our original motion we had asked

for relief under rule 6004(g), nobody objected to that and so we've added that sentence to the order of that provision, if Your Honor doesn't have a problem with it. Those are the only changes to the order that was originally filed, Your Honor.

anything to -- to say? All right. I will approve the debtor's entry into the EPGA and the pursuit of all the related transactions. The order, as revised, is fine with me. Clearly this is not a sub rosa plan but rather is an extremely important step that would enable the debtors to confirm a plan if such a plan met all the confirmation requirements of the code.

For the same reason, I'm comfortable in ordering that the ten day period, under Rule 6004(g) is waived accordingly. First, because of the consensual nature of this motion and second because it's clear that one of the benefits of this transaction and one of the reasons it's wholly consensual is that the debtor now intends to move expeditiously to get a plan confirmed and to take all the related steps, including preparing and filing registration statements and the like, and there's no reason, given the consensual nature of this relief, to slow down that process. So that order will get entered today.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, thank you very much. That concludes the matters on today's agenda.

	Pg 2	20 of 22	
			20
1		INDEX	
2		EXHIBITS	
3	OTHER'S	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	1-4	Declarations of Mr.	9
5		Sheehan, Mr. Reznich	k
6		and Mr. Miller	
7	77-82	Press Releases	10
8	83-90	Court Documents	10
9		regarding EPGA and	
10		PSA	
11	91-96	Court Documents	10
12		Relating to	
13		Current EPGA	
14	97-99	Demonstrative	10
15		Exhibits	
16	4-11	Transaction	9
17		Documents	
18	12-13	Black Lined Copies	9
19		Against earlier	
20		EPGA	
21	14-20	Highland Capital	9
22		Proposal Documents	
23			
24			
25			

	ry z	21 01 22				
						21
1	Exhibits (cont.)					
2						
3	21-44	Commun	nicatio	ns and	10	
4		Presei	ntation	s		
5		betwee	en High	land		
6		and De	elphi			
7	45-47	Black	line		10	
8		Invest	tment			
9		Propos	sal			
10	48-51	Prese	ntation	s by	10	
11		Roths	child,	Inc.		
12	52-58	Excer	ets fro	m	10	
13		Joint	Meetin	g of		
14		Delph:	i Statu	tory		
15		Commit	ttees			
16	59-76	Meeti	ngs of	Board	10	
17		of Dir	rectors			
18						
19			RULI	NGS		
20			Page	Line		
21	Approval of Debtor's	s	18	7		
22	Entry into EPGA					
23	Ten day Period		18	14		
24	Under 6004(g) Is Wa	ived				
25						

		22	
CERTIFICATION			
I,	Pnina Eilberg, court approved	transcriber, certify that the	
foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic			
sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled			
mat	ter.		
		August 5, 2007	
Sig	nature of Transcriber	Date	
	na Eilberg		
typ	ed or printed name		